

The 8th July, 1987

No. 9/2/87-6Lab./3999.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. (i) The Rohtak Ashoka Theater (P) Ltd. Rohtak (ii) B. R. Enterprises Ltd., Lessee c/o Bharat Tractors, Old Quila Road, Rohtak: —

**BEFORE SHRI B. P. JINDAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
ROHTAK**

Reference No. 99 of 87

between

**SHRI SUCHA RAM, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S (I) THE ROHTAK
ASHOKA THEATER (P) LTD, ROHTAK, (II) M/S R. R. ENTERPRISES LTD. LESSEE
C/O BHARAT TRACTORS OLD QUILA ROAD, ROHTAK**

Petitioner with S. N. Vats his A. R.

None for the respondent.

AWARD

1. In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute, between the workman Shri Sucha Ram and the management of M/s The Rohtak Ashoka Theater (P) Ltd., Rohtak, (ii) M/s R. R. Enterprises Lessee c/o Bharat Tractors Old Quila Road, Rohtak, to this Court, for adjudication,—*vide Haryana Government Gazette* Notification No. 12624—30, dated 27th March, 1987 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Sucha Ram is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. After receipt of the order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The respondents did not appear despite service. The case of the petitioner is that he was employed with the respondent as a Booking Clerk for the last about 15 years and that the respondent choose to terminate his services unlawfully on 16th May, 1986 in flagrant disregard of the provisions of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as the Act). He has claimed reinstatement with continuity of service and full back wages.

3. Respondent number 1 did not appear inspite of service through its Manager, Harish Bakshi. Similarly respondent number 2 refused service of the registered notice. So, *ex parte* proceedings order was passed against the respondent on 26th May, 1987 and 23rd April, 1987 respectively.

4. In *ex parte* evidence the petitioner himself appeared as WW-1 and made a statement completely in corroboration of his claim. He further stated that on the eve of termination of his services his monthly wages were Rs. 500/- p.m. and that since that date he is unemployed. I see no reason to disbelieve the unrebutted sworn deposition made by the petitioner and find that the respondents unlawfully terminated the services of the petitioner on 16th May, 1986 without complying with the mandatory provisions of section 25F of the said Act. So, the said order of termination cannot be sustained. The same is set aside. The petitioner is ordered to be reinstated with continuity of service and full back wages. The reference is answered and returned accordingly with no order as to cost.

B. P. JINDAL,

Dated the 30th May, 1987.

**Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.**

Endst. No. 99-87/1898, dated the 5th June, 1987.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

B. P. JINDAL,

**Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Rohtak.**